



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.				
10/609,193	06/27/2003	Michael Xie	SERVGATE0120	7604				
7590	06/01/2007		<table border="1"><tr><td colspan="2">EXAMINER</td></tr><tr><td colspan="2">OSMAN, RAMY M</td></tr></table>		EXAMINER		OSMAN, RAMY M	
EXAMINER								
OSMAN, RAMY M								
Bo-In Lin 13445 Mandoli Drive Los Altos Hills, CA 94022			<table border="1"><tr><td>ART UNIT</td><td>PAPER NUMBER</td></tr><tr><td>2157</td><td></td></tr></table>		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	2157	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER				
			2157					
<table border="1"><tr><td>MAIL DATE</td><td>DELIVERY MODE</td></tr><tr><td>06/01/2007</td><td>PAPER</td></tr></table>		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	06/01/2007	PAPER			
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE							
06/01/2007	PAPER							

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/609,193	Applicant(s) XIE, MICHAEL	
	Examiner Ramy M. Osman	Art Unit 2157	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 June 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 6/27/03 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. This action is responsive to application filed on June 27, 2003. Claims 1-22 are pending examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 1 recites the limitation "said traffic-profile conforming list" in line 11. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Applicant is requested to correct any subsequent occurrence of this limitation in other claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. **Claims 1-6,9-17,20-22 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by**

Klensin et al (US Patent No 6,564,327).

Art Unit: 2157

6. In reference to claim 1, Klensin teaches an Internet service gateway for controlling an access to an Internet web-site from a group of users comprising:

an Internet traffic monitor for logging and analyzing a number of Internet accesses to each of a plurality of Internet web-sites from said group of users through said Internet service gateway (column 5 lines 2-5 & 49-60); and

an Internet access blocking means for employing said number of Internet accesses for generating a list of traffic profile-suspect web-sites statistically conformed to a blocking-suspect-profile for selecting a list of blocking web-sites among said traffic-profile conforming list (column 6 lines 15-20 and column 8 lines 10-30).

7. In reference to claim 2, Klensin teaches the Internet service gateway of claim 1 wherein: said Internet traffic monitor further includes a traffic logger for continuously monitoring said Internet accesses and for generating an Internet traffic log (column 5 lines 2-5 and column 6 lines 15-20).

8. In reference to claim 3, Klensin teaches the Internet service gateway of claim 1 wherein: said Internet traffic monitor further includes a traffic analyzer for continuously counting and analyzing said Internet accesses to each of said Internet web-sites for generating said list of traffic profile-suspect Internet web-sites (column 8 lines 10-30).

9. In reference to claim 4, Klensin teaches the Internet service gateway of claim 1 wherein: said Internet access blocking means further includes a user interface for an access controller to provide a selection input for selecting said list of blocking web-sites among said list of traffic profile-suspect web-sites (column 8 lines 10-30).

Art Unit: 2157

10. In reference to claim 5, Klensin teaches the Internet service gateway of claim 4 wherein: said Internet access blocking means further includes an editor for allowing said access controller to edit said selection input for selecting said list of blocking web-sites among said list of traffic profile-suspect web-sites (column 8 lines 10-30).

11. In reference to claim 6, Klensin teaches the Internet service gateway of claim 4 wherein: said user interface further allows said access controller to provide an access-allowed list for selecting a list of access-allowed web-sites for removing said access-allowed web-sites from said list of traffic profile-suspect web-sites (column 8 lines 10-30).

12. In reference to claim 9, Klensin teaches an Internet service gateway for controlling an access to an Internet web-site from a group of users comprising:

a traffic logger for continuously monitoring a number of Internet accesses to each of a plurality of Internet web-sites from said group of users through said Internet service gateway for generating an Internet traffic log (column 6 lines 15-20);

a traffic analyzer for continuously counting and analyzing said Internet traffic log for generating a list of traffic profile-suspect Internet web-sites statistically conformed to a blocking suspect traffic-profile (column 5 lines 2-5);

an editor for allowing said access controller to edit a selection input for selecting said list of blocking web-sites among said list of traffic profile-suspect web-sites (column 8 lines 10-30);
and

a user interface to allow said access controller to provide said selection input to block access to a list of blocking web-sites among said list of traffic profile-suspect-web-sites (column 8 lines 10-30).

Art Unit: 2157

13. In reference to claim 10, Klensin teaches an Internet service gateway for controlling an access to a networked node from a group of users comprising: a network traffic controller for continuously monitoring and analyzing accesses to a plurality of networked nodes from said group of users to enable an option for selectively blocking access to one of said networked nodes according to data analyzed from continuously monitoring and analyzing of said accesses (column 8 lines 10-30).

14. In reference to claim 11, Klensin teaches the Internet service gateway of claim 10 further comprising: a gateway administer interface for enabling a gateway administer to select a blocking list for selectively blocking access to one of said networked nodes according to data obtained from continuously monitoring and analyzing said accesses (column 8 lines 10-30).

15. In reference to claims 12-17 & 20-22, claims 12-17 & 20-22 are method claims that correspond to claims 1-6 & 9-11 as rejected above. Therefore claims 12-17 & 20-22 are rejected based upon the same rationale as given for the rejection for claims 1-6 & 9-11.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

16. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

17. **Claims 7,8,18,19 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Klensin et al (US Patent No 6,564,327) in view of Bunch (US Patent No 6,795,856).**

Art Unit: 2157

18. In reference to claims 7 and 18, Klensin teaches the Internet service gateway of claim 3 and the corresponding method of claim 15. Klensin fails to explicitly teach wherein: said traffic analyzer further includes a most-frequently visited web-site counter for continuously counting and analyzing said Internet accesses to each of said Internet web-sites for generating a list of most frequently-visited web-sites for implementation as said list of traffic profile-suspect Internet web-sites. However, Bunch teaches analyzing traffic to generate a log of frequently accessed web sites, for the purpose of monitoring Internet usage and managing Internet access abuses (column 3 lines 14-50 and column 10 lines 15-40).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Klensin wherein said traffic analyzer further includes a most-frequently visited web-site counter for continuously counting and analyzing said Internet accesses to each of said Internet web-sites for generating a list of most frequently-visited web-sites for implementation as said list of traffic profile-suspect Internet web-sites as per the teachings of Bunch for the purpose of monitoring Internet usage and managing Internet access abuses.

19. In reference to claims 8 and 19, Klensin teaches the Internet service gateway of claim 3 and the corresponding method of claim 15. Klensin fails to explicitly teach wherein: said traffic analyzer further includes a traffic-volume analyzer for continuously counting a traffic volume to each of said Internet web-sites for generating a list of most traffic-generated web-sites implementation as said list of traffic profile-suspect Internet web-sites. However, Bunch teaches analyzing traffic to generate a log of frequently accessed web sites, for the purpose of monitoring Internet usage and managing Internet access abuses (column 3 lines 14-50 and column 10 lines 15-40).

Art Unit: 2157

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Klensin wherein said traffic analyzer further includes a traffic-volume analyzer for continuously counting a traffic volume to each of said Internet web-sites for generating a list of most traffic-generated web-sites implementation as said list of traffic profile-suspect Internet web-sites as per the teachings of Bunch for the purpose of monitoring Internet usage and managing Internet access abuses.

Conclusion

20. The claims have been given their broadest reasonable interpretation. Applicant is advised that the above specified citations of the relied upon prior art are only representative of the teachings of the prior art, and that any other supportive sections within the entirety of the reference (including any figures, incorporation by references, claims and priority documents) is implied as being applied to teach the scope of the claims.

21. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See attached Form 892.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ramy M. Osman whose telephone number is (571) 272-4008. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2157

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

RMO

May 22, 2007


YVES DALENCOURT
PRIMARY EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100